

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 7 and 9 have been cancelled, while claims 1, 8 and 10 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 7. In addition, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Patent Application No. WO 02/067125 to Millard et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099952 to Lambert et al.

The Millard et al. reference discloses a system and method for licensing content on updatable storage media, e.g., a DVD, in which new licensed content is downloaded and stored onto the updateable storage medium. For example, a user may desire to download a music video corresponding to an audio track stored on the storage medium.

The Lambert et al. reference discloses policies for secure software execution, in which, as noted by the Examiner, a "fingerprint" of a content is provided for identifying the content.

Applicants submit that Millard et al. does not disclose the feature of providing a user interface for selecting a content item, or the feature of retrieving a part of a master copy of the content item as further content item, the part not being present in the content item. Millard et al. remains silent with respect to these features.

The problem of addressed by the subject invention is that the content item may be of insufficient quality, e.g., the credits of a movie may be missing or there may be an interfered part due to a bad signal (see page 2, line 34 to page 3, line 2 of the subject specification as filed), and that the user may for that reason consider that the content item is not worth storing permanently.

The afore-mentioned problem is solved by the subject invention, in that a part of a master copy of the content item is retrieved as the further content item, the part not being present in the content item. The missing or interfered parts are retrieved to make the content items of the same quality as the master copy (see lines 3 and 4 of page 3 of the subject specification).

Applicants stress that Millard et al. does not disclose any leading suggestion or incentive to address the above-mentioned problem and does not disclose any teaching, suggestion or incentive to use the solution of the claimed invention.

Applicants further submit that Lambert et al. does not supply that which is missing from Millard et al.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicants believes that this application, containing claims 1-6, 8 and 10, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611